

aaa. Middle of first dorsal much nearer root of ventrals than pectorals; snout rather short, its width a little greater than distance between angles of mouth. First dorsal longer than high, its blunt tip when depressed not reaching tip of posterior lobe, its margin deeply incised, its base $2\frac{1}{4}$ times in the interval between dorsals; teeth rather sharp; lower lobe of caudal blunt; tail less than one-fifth length of body, its terminal lobe more than one-third its length; pectorals rather obtuse, their free margin little concave, their tips reaching little past front of dorsal; inner lobe of ventrals somewhat produced; embryo attached to uterus by a placenta; color rather dark; axils of pectorals and ventrals dusky.....CALIFORNICUS.*

DESCRIPTION OF A NEW SHARK (*CARCHARIAS LAMIELLA*) FROM
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

By DAVID S. JORDAN and CHARLES H. GILBERT.

Allied to *Carcharias lamia* (Risso).

Body comparatively robust, the back elevated, the greatest depth half more than the height of the dorsal fin and equal to the distance from the nostril to the gill-openings.

Head broad and flat, the snout long, but wide and rounded. Length of snout from mouth greater than the distance between outer angles of nostrils, a little more than width of mouth. Nostrils considerably nearer the eye than tip of snout, but nearer snout than angle of mouth. Eyes moderate.

Teeth about $\frac{3}{10}$, not very large, the upper rather narrowly triangular, nearly erect, slightly concave on the outer margin, but not notched, rather finely serrated everywhere. Lower teeth similar, but considerably narrower, finely serrated. Middle teeth in both jaws smaller than the others.

A pair of jaws taken from a much larger specimen have, as usual, the teeth considerably broader than in the young and more distinctly serrate. They are quite similar to the teeth of *C. lamia*.

First dorsal beginning at a distance four-fifths the length of its own base behind the root of pectorals, and ending at a point somewhat more than its own base before the ventrals, its height slightly more than the distance from the snout to the posterior margin of the eye, slightly more than its base, and considerably less than greatest height of body. Space between dorsals equal to the distance from snout to first gill-opening, $2\frac{2}{3}$ times base of first dorsal, 7 times base of second.

Second dorsal very small, not one-sixth the size of the first and considerably smaller than the anal, which is deeply emarginate, the two fins nearly opposite each other. Ventrals small, nearly midway between the two dorsals. Tail long, forming nearly two-sevenths of the total length. Pectorals broad and long, not pointed, their tips reach-

* *Mustelus californicus* Gill, Proc. Ac. Nat. Sci. Phila. 1864, 148: = *Mystelus hiunulus* Jor. & Gilb. Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus. 1881, 31 (not of Blainville). Coast of Southern California, San Francisco, Monterey, Santa Barbara, San Pedro, San Diego (Jor. & Gilb).

ing somewhat past the end of the base of the dorsal, the inner margin a little less than one third the outer, their length $5\frac{2}{3}$ in total.

Color, plain light gray, white below; edge of pectorals and caudal narrowly dusky.

A young male specimen of this species (27,366), two feet in length, was obtained by us in San Diego Bay, California. It is said to be not uncommon along the coast of Lower California and it is known at San Diego as "Bay Shark." The jaws of an adult example taken on the coast of Lower California were also procured.

It is evidently closely related to *C. lamia*, but the smaller dorsal and pectorals and the more backward position of the dorsal seem to distinguish it sufficiently. The fins seem to be less falcate than in *C. lamia*. * In the Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus. 1881, p. 32, this species is mentioned by us under the name of *Eulamia lamia*.

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE TREE-CREEPERS (CERTHIA) OF EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.

By ROBERT RIDGWAY.

The question of whether the American tree-creeper is separable from the European as a distinct race or species has long been a mooted point, and one in regard to which there is great difference of opinion among writers. Several eminent authorities, both in Europe and America, consider the European and North American birds of this genus as identical, or not separable even as races; but not a few authors, who base their conclusions on ample material, and are not influenced by ultra-conservative views regarding geographical variations, agree in recognizing two European races or species (according to the individual views of the author), one being the true *C. familiaris* Linn. of northern Europe, the other of more southern range, and variously designated as *C. costae* Bailly or *C. trachydactyla* Brehm;* and in considering the common American bird as distinct from both the European forms, though some of them have referred it to *C. costae*.

The North American creeper was first separated, as *C. americana* (by which name it has been known by American ornithologists up to a comparatively recent date), by Bonaparte in 1838; but having been already named many years previously (by Bartram, in 1791, as *C. rufa*, and Barton, in 1799, as *C. fusca*), Bonaparte's name cannot be used. The Mexican creeper was also separated in 1834, by Gloger, as *C. mexicana*. Thus two European and two American races or species of *Certhia* have been recognized by many ornithologists of standing. Others, however, pro-

* It is unnecessary for me to discuss here the question of which of these names should be adopted; therefore, without inquiring particularly into the case, I adopt provisionally the former.